



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1

IN RE APPLICATION OF:

Robert E. Allen et al

Serial No. 09/773,190

Filed: January 31, 2001

For: Transaction Status  
Messaging

\$  
\$  
\$  
\$  
\$  
\$  
\$  
\$

Examiner: Ojo O. Oyebisi

Art Unit: 3628

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

This Brief is submitted in triplicate in support of the Appeal in  
the above-identified application.

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**  
**37 CFR 1.8(a)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First-Class Mail in an  
envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on the date below:

December 7, 2005

Date

*Robert V. Wilder*

Signature

**APPEAL BRIEF**  
**PAGE 1 OF 22**

*Serial Number 09/773,190*  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST .....	4
RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES .....	4
STATUS OF CLAIMS .....	4
STATUS OF AMENDMENTS .....	4
SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION .....	5
ISSUES .....	6
GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS .....	7
ARGUMENT .....	7
I. With regard to the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 13-19, 21 and 23-28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter in view of Burrus, it is submitted that there is no suggestion in either reference for the proposed combination and even the proposed combination fails to suggest several of the claimed features. .... 7	
II. With regard to the rejection of claims 8 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter, in view of Burrus and in still further view of Harrington, it is submitted that there is no suggestion in any of the references for the proposed combination and even the proposed combination fails to suggest several of the claimed features..... 11	

APPEAL BRIEF  
PAGE 2 OF 22

*Serial Number 09/773,190*  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

77	III. With regard to the rejection of claims 10-12 and 22-24	
78	as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Potter, in view of	
79	Burrus and <del>in</del> still further view of Davis, it is submitted that	
80	the hypothetical combination of Potter, Burrus and Davis cannot	
81	render claims 10-12 and 22-24 obvious under 35 USC 103(a) since	
82	there is no suggestion in any of the three references for the	
83	proposed combination, and even the proposed hypothetical	
84	combination fails to suggest several of the claimed features..	12
85		
86		
87	CONCLUSION .....	12
88		
89	APPENDIX (Pending Claims) .....	14-22
90		



**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The present application is assigned to International Business Machines Corporation, the real party in interest.

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no related Appeals or Interferences currently pending.

**STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-28 are pending and stand finally rejected by the Examiner as noted in the Final Office Action mailed July 7, 2005.

**STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

Prior to the Final Office Action (mailed 7/7/05), there was only one substantive Office Action mailed 7/20/2004 and one substantive Amendment mailed 10/19/2004. The Second and Final Office Action cited four new references, Potter (5,787,402), Burrus (4,716,523), Harrington (6,161,099) and Davis (6,041,314) for the first time and rejected claims 1-28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the newly cited references. More specifically, claims 1-7, 9, 13-19, 21 and 23-28 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable

**APPEAL BRIEF  
PAGE 4 OF 22**

***Serial Number 09/773,190*  
Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

over Potter in view of Burrus, claims 8 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter in view of Burrus and in still further view of Harrington, and claims 10-12 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter in view of Burrus and in still further view of Davis. The last entered substantive amendment was submitted 10/19/2004 which amended the claims to the text shown in the Appendix.

#### SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The present application discloses a method and implementing computer system in which a client is able to initiate an ongoing electronic transaction between a communication device (403 Figure 4) and a network site 401 Figure 4). A separate port (Port C Figure 4) is established for the subsequent direct transmission of transaction status messages from the network site 401 back to the user device 403. The client is enabled (325 Figure 3) to customize a signaling system (323 Figure 3) at the user terminal to designate various signals to correspond to different kinds of the transaction status messages such that the client is signaled (611 Figure 6) directly when a transaction status change occurs (605 Figure 6) with respect to the electronic transaction initiated by the client.

The above methodology is set forth in pending claim 1, which recites:

**APPEAL BRIEF  
PAGE 5 OF 22**

***Serial Number 09/773,190***  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

147  
148 "1. A method for processing electronic transactions, said method comprising:

149  
150 receiving input by a server terminal from a client device over a first communication port to initiate  
151 an electronic transaction, said electronic transaction requiring a subsequent communication of an  
152 occurrence of a subsequent event from said server terminal to said client device;

153  
154 establishing a second communication port on said client device for directly coupling said server  
155 terminal to said client device;

156  
157 disconnecting said server terminal from said client device;

158  
159 re-connecting said server terminal to said client device through said second communication port  
160 by said server terminal upon an occurrence of said subsequent event; and

161  
162 transferring said subsequent communication information regarding said electronic transaction  
163 subsequent event from said server terminal to said client device over said second communication  
164 port..

165  
166 **ISSUES**

167  
168 1. Is the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 13-19, 21 and  
169 23-28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter in  
170 view of Burrus well founded?

171  
172 2. Is the Examiner's rejection of claims 8 and 20 under 35 USC

**APPEAL BRIEF**  
**PAGE 6 OF 22**

***Serial Number 09/773,190***  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

173 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter, in view of Burrus and  
174 in still further view of Harrington well founded?  
175

176 3. Is the Examiner's rejection of claims 10-12 and 22-24 as being  
177 unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Potter, in view of Burrus  
178 and in still further view of Davis well founded?  
179

180

181 **GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS**

182

183 For purposes of this Appeal, claims 1-28 stand or fall together.  
184

185

186

187 **ARGUMENT**

188

189 **I.** With regard to the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 13-19, 21 and  
190 23-28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter in  
191 view of Burrus, it is submitted that there is no suggestion in  
192 either reference for the proposed combination and even the  
193 proposed combination fails to suggest several of the claimed  
194 features.

195

196 All of the independent claims, i.e. claims 1, 13, 25, 26 and 28,  
197 are included in the group of claims that was rejected under 35  
198 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by the newly cited Potter and  
199 Burrus references. Potter discloses a system for performing a  
200 financial transaction in which a bank program prompts a user for  
201 input and automatically assembles an offer response to the  
customer based on a number of different parameters. If the

**APPEAL BRIEF**

**PAGE 7 OF 22**

202 customer delays for too long in accepting the offer, the bank  
203 program automatically withdraws the offer and updates the offer  
204 to avoid a "stale" conversion rate. Potter does not disclose  
205 "receiving input by a server terminal over a first port",  
206 "establishing a second communication port on said client device  
207 for directly coupling said server and said client device",  
208 "disconnecting..", "reconnecting ..." and "transferring a  
209 subsequent communication over a second communication port", as  
210 those recitations are clearly set forth in the independent claims  
211 1, 13, 25, 26 and 28. In the exemplary embodiment illustrated in  
212 the application, after a user places a bid in an auction, a  
213 second port is established for directly coupling said server and  
214 said client device. Nothing even similar is shown or suggested by  
215 Potter. Next in the example, the user is disconnected but is  
216 alerted and advised directly when the user's entered bid is no  
217 longer a winning bid (i.e. another bidder had entered a higher  
218 bid). Nothing even similar is shown or suggested by Potter. Next,  
219 the user is allowed to re-enter the auction site to place a new  
220 bid before the auction is completed. Nothing even similar is  
221 shown or suggested by Potter. The process disclosed and claimed  
222 by the applicant is accomplished through code on the server which  
223 is effective, in connection with the bidding process, to  
224 establish or initialize a new direct alert port (separate from  
225 the port being used for the initial registration) between the  
226 auction site and the user terminal for the transmission of  
227 messages from the auction site server to the user terminal. The  
228 server code compares the user's bid with subsequent received  
229 bids, and when the user's bid is no longer winning, the server  
230 sends a message to the user terminal over the assigned separate  
231 port to sound the user-selected audio alert scenario. When the

**APPEAL BRIEF**  
**PAGE 8 OF 22**

*Serial Number 09/773,190*  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

232 user hears the alert, the user knows that the user's bid is no  
233 longer winning. At that time the user may return to the auction  
234 site to enter a new bid. There is not even a suggestion in Potter  
235 that a second port be established for subsequent communication,  
236 and that the client-server link be disconnected, and that,  
237 subsequent thereto, a second communication link be established by  
238 the server through the second port for communicating the  
239 occurrence of a subsequent event, i.e. the change of status of  
240 the entered bid. The disconnect-reconnect sequence of the present  
241 invention is a necessary claimed element of the present invention  
242 but is not suggested anywhere in the Potter reference. Further,  
243 there is no section of the Potter patent even referenced by the  
244 Examiner in the Final Office Action to correspond, *inter alia*, to  
245 the claimed establishment of a second port, and then the  
246 disconnect and reconnect sequence as claimed by the applicant.  
247 The establishment of a second port is required to enable the  
248 server to reconnect to the client upon the occurrence of a  
249 subsequent higher bid. In Potter, if the customer delays too long  
250 in accepting an offer from a bank, the offer is withdrawn (not  
251 disconnected) and updated using the same port. This "withdrawal"  
252 is cited by the Examiner on page 2 of the Final Office Action as  
253 being equivalent to the disconnect-reconnect feature of the  
254 present invention. Clearly this is neither stated nor intended by  
255 Potter. Potter maintains a single port and merely changes offer  
256 terms and conditions. There is no disconnection or re-connection  
257 or establishment of a second port specifically assigned to  
258 communicate information from the server to the customer upon the  
259 occurrence of an event happening after the client has  
260 disconnected.

APPEAL BRIEF  
PAGE 9 OF 22

*Serial Number 09/773,190*  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

262 Burrus is cited to show a dual mode data transfer controller with  
263 numerous communication ports. The Examiner alleges that "since  
264 *Burrus ports can be configured to support different mode (sic) of*  
265 *operations, one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified*  
266 *the device of Potter to include a dual mode data transfer*  
267 *controller with two ports configured to receive data on one and*  
268 *transmit data on another to speed up the delivery rate of*  
269 *transaction messages to a user device". There is no referenced*  
270 language or suggestion in the Burrus patent or any other  
271 reference for the Examiner's "conclusion" as stated above.  
272 Further, there is no reason, either explicitly stated or even  
273 suggested in Burrus or Potter that would prompt one to combine  
274 the two references for any purpose. Further, even a forced  
275 insertion of the Burrus dual mode data transfer controller into  
276 the Potter system (a combination for which there is no suggestion  
277 in either reference) would render the Potter system inoperable  
278 for its intended purpose and still fall short of rendering the  
279 present invention obvious since there would still be no  
280 establishing of a second port for subsequent server-initiated  
281 communication from a server to a client as is clearly set forth  
282 in applicant's independent claims 1, 13, 25, 26 and 28. It is  
283 noted that applicant's establishment of a second port is for the  
284 purpose of enabling a subsequent re-connection from the server to  
285 the client whereas the use of dual mode data transfer controller  
286 in Burrus is for the purpose of eliminating time delays in  
287 overall memory access throughput - two entirely different  
288 purposes cannot suggest a combination. Thus it is submitted that  
289 claims 1, 13, 25, 26 and 28 are allowable under 35 USC 103(a)  
290 over Potter even in view of Burrus. Further, since the remaining  
291 claims of the group rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Potter in

APPEAL BRIEF  
PAGE 10 OF 22

view of Burrus, i.e. claims 2-7, 9, 14-19, 21, 23-24 and 27, include the limitations described above which are not even suggested by either Potter or Burrus, it is submitted that all of the claims of the first group, i.e. claims 1-7, 9, 13-19, 21 and 23-28 are allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over Potter in view of Burrus.

II. With regard to the rejection of claims 8 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter, in view of Burrus and in still further view of Harrington, it is submitted that there is no suggestion in any of the references for the proposed combination and even the proposed combination fails to suggest several of the claimed features. It is noted that Harrington discloses a process and apparatus for conducting auctions over electronic networks but, like Potter and Burrus, does not disclose, or even suggest, the establishment of a second port for subsequent incoming server communications, and then the client disconnect and server reconnect sequence and the sending of server information over the newly established second communication port as disclosed and claimed by the applicant. Further, claims 8 and 20 are dependent claims and include all of the limitations of claims 1 and 13 which have hereinbefore been distinguished from the Potter and Burrus references. Thus, even a hypothetical combination of Potter, Burrus and Harrington fails to suggest the combination claimed by the applicant in claims 8 and 20 and therefore it is submitted that claims 8 and 20 are allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over Potter in view of Burrus and in still further view of Harrington.

**APPEAL BRIEF  
PAGE 11 OF 22**

***Serial Number 09/773,190***  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

III. With regard to the rejection of claims 10-12 and 22-24 as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a) over Potter, in view of Burrus and in still further view of Davis, it is submitted that the hypothetical combination of Potter, Burrus and Davis cannot render claims 10-12 and 22-24 obvious under 35 USC 103(a) since there is no suggestion in any of the three references for the proposed combination, and even the proposed hypothetical combination fails to suggest several of the claimed features, including, *inter alia*, the establishment of a second port for subsequent incoming server communications, and then the client disconnect and server reconnect sequence and the sending of server information over the newly established second communication port as disclosed and claimed by the applicant. Further, claims 10-12 and 22-24 are dependent claims and include all of the limitations of claims 1 and 13 which have hereinbefore been distinguished from the Potter and Burrus references. Thus, even a hypothetical combination of Potter, Burrus and Davis (which was cited merely to show a portable wireless unit) fails to suggest the combination claimed by the applicant in claims 10-12 and 22-24 and therefore it is submitted that claims 10-12 and 22-24 are allowable under 35 USC 103(a) over Potter in view of Burrus and in still further view of Davis.

#### CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, applicant urges the Board to conclude that the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 13-19, 21 and 23-28 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter in view of Burrus, and the rejection of claims 8 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a)

APPEAL BRIEF  
PAGE 12 OF 22

*Serial Number 09/773,190*  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

as being unpatentable over Potter in view of Burrus and in still further view of Harrington, and the rejection of claims 10-12 and 22-24 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Potter in view of Burrus and in still further view of Davis, are not well-founded and should be reversed.

Please charge IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447 in the amount of \$500.00 for submission of a Brief in Support of Appeal. No additional fee or extension of time is believed to be required; however, in the event an additional fee or extension of time is required, please charge the fee, as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application, to the above-identified deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

*Robert V. Wilder*

---

Robert V. Wilder (Tel:512-246-8555)  
Registration No. 26,352  
Attorney for Applicant  
4235 Kingsburg Drive  
Round Rock, Texas 78681

**APPEAL BRIEF**  
**PAGE 13 OF 22**

***Serial Number 09/773,190***  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

**APPENDIX**

1. A method for processing electronic transactions, said method comprising:

receiving input by a server terminal from a client device over a first communication port to initiate an electronic transaction, said electronic transaction requiring a subsequent communication of an occurrence of a subsequent event from said server terminal to said client device;

establishing a second communication port on said client device for directly coupling said server terminal to said client device;

disconnecting said server terminal from said client device;

re-connecting said server terminal to said client device through said second communication port by said server terminal upon an occurrence of said subsequent event; and

transferring said subsequent communication regarding said subsequent event from said server terminal to said client device over said second communication port.

2. The method as set forth in claim 1 and further including:

detecting receipt of said transaction information by said client device; and

providing an audio effect by said client device upon detection of

405 receipt of said transaction information.

406  
407 3. The method as set forth in claim 2 wherein said audio effect  
408 comprises an alert signal effective to alert a client that said  
409 transaction information has been received, said client device  
410 further including client input means arranged for enabling a  
411 client to select characteristics of said audio effect.

412  
413 4. The method as set forth in claim 3 wherein said input means is  
414 effective to enable said client to select one or more tones as  
415 said alert signal.

416  
417 5. The method as set forth in claim 3 wherein said input means is  
418 effective to enable said client to select a predetermined voice  
419 message as said alert signal.

420  
421 6. The method as set forth in claim 5 wherein, in addition to  
422 said predetermined voice message, said input means is effective  
423 to enable said client to select from a number of audio signals to  
424 comprise said alert signal.

425  
426 7. The method as set forth in claim 1 wherein said electronic  
427 transaction comprises a purchase of an item by a client using  
428 said client device.

429  
430 8. The method as set forth in claim 1 wherein said electronic  
431 transaction comprises an auction transaction wherein bids for an  
432 item being auctioned are sent by said client device and received  
433 by said server terminal, said server terminal being operable for:  
434

**APPEAL BRIEF**  
**PAGE 15 OF 22**

***Serial Number 09/773,190***  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

435 receiving bids for said item by said server terminal;  
436  
437 determining when a previously received bid is no longer a winning  
438 bid; and  
439  
440 sending notice that said previously received bid is no longer a  
441 winning bid, said notice comprising said transaction information  
442 sent over said second communication port.  
443  
444 9. The method as set forth in claim 1 wherein said client device  
445 is a computer system connected to said server terminal.  
446  
447 10. The method as set forth in claim 1 wherein said client device  
448 is a wireless device.  
449  
450 11. The method as set forth in claim 10 wherein said wireless  
451 device is a cellular device.  
452  
453 12. The method as set forth in claim 10 wherein said wireless  
454 device is a portable device.  
455  
456 13. A system for processing electronic transactions, said system  
457 comprising:  
458  
459 a server terminal;  
460  
461 a client device; and  
462  
463 means arranged for selectively connecting said client device to  
464 said server terminal, said server terminal being selectively

**APPEAL BRIEF**  
**PAGE 16 OF 22**

***Serial Number 09/773,190***  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

465 operable for:  
466  
467 receiving input by said server terminal from said client device  
468 over a first communication port to initiate an electronic  
469 transaction, said electronic transaction requiring a subsequent  
470 communication of an occurrence of a subsequent event from said  
471 server terminal to said client device;  
472  
473 establishing a second communication port on said client device  
474 for directly coupling said server terminal to said client device;  
475  
476 disconnecting said server terminal from said client device;  
477  
478 re-connecting said server terminal to said client device through  
479 said second communication port by said server terminal upon an  
480 occurrence of said subsequent event; and  
481  
482 transferring said subsequent communication regarding said  
483 subsequent event from said server terminal to said client device  
484 over said second communication port.  
485  
486 14. The system as set forth in claim 13 wherein said client  
487 device is selectively operable for:  
488  
489 detecting receipt of said transaction information from said  
490 server terminal; and  
491  
492 providing an audio effect upon detection of receipt of said  
493 transaction information.  
494

**APPEAL BRIEF  
PAGE 17 OF 22**

***Serial Number 09/773,190***  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

495 15. The system as set forth in claim 14 wherein said audio effect  
496 comprises an alert signal effective to alert a client that said  
497 transaction information has been received, said client device  
498 further including client input means arranged for enabling a  
499 client to select characteristics of said audio effect.  
500  
501 16. The system as set forth in claim 15 wherein said input means  
502 is effective to enable said client to select one or more tones as  
503 said alert signal.  
504  
505 17. The system as set forth in claim 15 wherein said input means  
506 is effective to enable said client to select a predetermined  
507 voice message as said alert signal.  
508  
509 18. The system as set forth in claim 17 wherein, in addition to  
510 said predetermined voice message, said input means is effective  
511 to enable said client to select from a number of audio signals to  
512 comprise said alert signal.  
513  
514 19. The system as set forth in claim 13 wherein said electronic  
515 transaction comprises a purchase of an item by a client using  
516 said client device.  
517  
518 20. The system as set forth in claim 13 wherein said electronic  
519 transaction comprises an auction transaction wherein bids for an  
520 item being auctioned are sent by said client device and received  
521 by said server terminal, said server terminal being operable for:  
522  
523 receiving bids for said item by said server terminal;  
524

**APPEAL BRIEF**  
**PAGE 18 OF 22**

***Serial Number 09/773,190***  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

525 determining when a previously received bid is no longer a winning  
526 bid; and  
527  
528 sending notice that said previously received bid is no longer a  
529 winning bid, said notice comprising said transaction information  
530 sent over said second communication port.  
531  
532 21. The system as set forth in claim 13 wherein said client  
533 device is a computer system connected to said server terminal.  
534  
535 22. The system as set forth in claim 13 wherein said client  
536 device is a wireless device.  
537  
538 23. The system as set forth in claim 22 wherein said wireless  
539 device is a cellular device.  
540  
541 24. The system as set forth in claim 22 wherein said wireless  
542 device is a portable device.  
543  
544 25. A server terminal arranged for processing electronic  
545 transactions, said server terminal comprising:  
546  
547 means for receiving input from a client device over a first  
548 communication port to initiate an electronic transaction, said  
549 electronic transaction requiring a subsequent communication of an  
550 occurrence of a subsequent event from said server terminal to  
551 said client device;  
552  
553 means for establishing a second communication port on said client  
554 device for directly coupling said server terminal to said client

**APPEAL BRIEF**  
**PAGE 19 OF 22**

***Serial Number 09/773,190***  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

555 device;  
556  
557 means for disconnecting said server terminal from said client  
558 device;  
559  
560 means for re-connecting said server terminal to said client  
561 device through said second communication port by said server  
562 terminal upon an occurrence of said subsequent event; and  
563  
564 means for transferring said subsequent communication regarding  
565 said subsequent event from said server terminal to said client  
566 device over said second communication port.  
567  
568 26. A client device for participating in an electronic  
569 transaction, said client device comprising:  
570  
571 input means selectively operable for inputting client-related  
572 transaction information relevant to said electronic transaction;  
573  
574 means for transmitting said client-related transaction  
575 information to a server terminal over a first port, said server  
576 terminal being operable in response to said client-related  
577 transaction information for establishing a second port  
578 selectively operable for sending server-related transaction  
579 information to said client device;  
580  
581 means for disconnecting said server terminal from said client  
582 device;  
583  
584 means for re-connecting said server terminal to said client

**APPEAL BRIEF**  
**PAGE 20 OF 22**

***Serial Number 09/773,190***  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**

585 device through said second port by said server terminal for  
586 sending server-related transaction information to said client  
587 device; and

588  
589 means for selectively receiving said server-related transaction  
590 information from said server terminal over said second port.

591  
592 27. The client device as set forth in claim 26 and further  
593 including audio means operable to produce an audio effect in  
594 response to receipt of said server-related transaction  
595 information.

596  
597 28. A storage medium including machine readable coded indicia,  
598 said machine readable coded indicia being selectively operable  
599 when executed within a computer system for accomplishing the  
600 steps of:

601  
602 receiving input by a server terminal from a client device over a  
603 first communication port to initiate an electronic transaction,  
604 said electronic transaction requiring a subsequent communication  
605 of an occurrence of a subsequent event from said server terminal  
606 to said client device;

607  
608 establishing a second communication port on said client device  
609 for directly coupling said server terminal to said client device;

610  
611 disconnecting said server terminal from said client device;

612  
613 re-connecting said server terminal to said client device through  
614 said second communication port by said server terminal upon an

**APPEAL BRIEF**  
**PAGE 21 OF 22**

615 occurrence of said subsequent event; and  
616  
617 transferring said subsequent communication regarding said  
618 subsequent event from said server terminal to said client device  
619 over said second communication port.  
620  
621

**APPEAL BRIEF**  
**PAGE 22 OF 22**

***Serial Number 09/773,190***  
**Attorney Docket No. AUS920010007US1**